United Nations S/AC.44/SR.31

Security Council

Provisional

Distr.: General
16 June 2010

Original: English

Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004)

Provisional summary record of the 31st meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 17 March 2010, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Heller ..... (Mexico)

Contents

Adoption of the agenda

Introductory remarks by the Chair

Briefings by the coordinators of the Committee's working groups

Report on the work of the group of experts

Other matters

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

10-27459 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

1. *The agenda was adopted.*

Introductory remarks by the Chair

2. **The Chair** said that the final document on the 2009 comprehensive review of the status of implementation of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) (S/2010/52, annex) should serve as a guide for the work of the Committee. That document identified a number of areas, such as biological weapons, means of delivery, national control lists, and access to related materials and financing of prohibited or illicit proliferation activities, where further work was needed to promote implementation of the resolution. Under the Committee's ninth programme of work, for the period from 1 February 2010 to 31 January 2011 (S/2010/112, annex), the working group on monitoring and implementation had assumed the responsibilities and authorities of the three subcommittees, which had not met recently owing to the fact that many matrices were still pending.

3. As Chair of the Committee, he had already attended the 2010 Moscow Non-proliferation Conference, as well as a preparatory meeting in The Hague for the Nuclear Security Summit to be held in Washington, D.C. in April 2010. While in the Netherlands he had also met with representatives of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and during his visit to the Russian Federation he had had useful discussions with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

4. Six areas of activity were particularly important in terms of achieving the Committee's goals, namely to (i) follow up the recommendations contained in the final document on the 2009 comprehensive review; (ii) achieve the first-time submission of reports by Member States that had not previously reported to the Committee; (iii) conclude the analysis of the remaining matrices, with the support of the group of experts, who should also be asked to work on preparing a more user-friendly, accessible matrix format; (iv) conduct outreach to other Member States and international organizations, including regional and subregional organizations, and strengthen efforts to raise awareness of the resolution among parliamentarians and senior government officials; (v) enhance coordination between the Committee and its group of experts; and (vi) establish the basis for negotiating the renewal of the Committee's mandate in 2011 through the adoption of a new Security Council resolution. It was important to consolidate the Committee's role as a platform for cooperation between Member States in their efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. He intended to convene a meeting of the Committee at least once a month.

5. **Mr. Chatel** (France) asked how the Committee could support the forthcoming Nuclear Security Summit. His delegation was ready to work with the Chairman and the delegation of the United States of America in planning the Committee's contribution.

6. **The Chair** said that he had been invited to attend the two meetings held to prepare for the Nuclear Security Summit. At the second meeting, in The Hague, he had given a presentation, subsequently distributed to the participants, on the work of the Committee.

7. **Mr. Gordon** (United States of America) said that the Nuclear Security Summit represented a good opportunity for the Committee to be involved in an event that was directly relevant to its mandate. On another point, he wondered whether the Committee might consider establishing a co-coordinator for each of its four working groups, in order to foster greater participation by Committee members.

8. **Mr. Ochoa** (Mexico) said that his delegation considered that the current structure of the Committee was satisfactory and that it did not need to further fragment its work.

9. **Mr. Chatel** (France) reiterated that the Nuclear Security Summit was one of the key events of 2010 and was of direct relevance to the Committee's work. The Committee should therefore prepare its contribution to the Summit and plan how to present its activities; it must not give the impression of being merely a "side show".

10. **Mr. Gordon** (United States of America), responding to the points raised by the representative of France, said that while his delegation had not yet received any firm instructions from its capital, considerable thought was being given to the question of how best to ensure the Committee's substantive involvement in the Summit.

11. **The Chair** said that contacts had been made with the host country, which was still working to determine the most appropriate format for the Summit. Mexico had indicated its willingness to give a presentation at the Summit on the Committee's work. More information would be available at a later date.

Briefings by the coordinators of the Committee's working groups

12. **The Chair** recalled that, in its ninth programme of work, the Committee had indicated that it would operate a system of working groups. He invited the coordinators of those working groups to brief the Committee on their work.

13. **Mr. Chatel** (France), speaking in his capacity as coordinator of the working group on assistance, said that the working group had focused on four main issues to date: (i) following up assistance activities, in order to understand more clearly the real effects of the Committee's work and better monitor the activities of the group of experts; (ii) promoting country-specific visits, notably in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; (iii) organizing an event to facilitate the matching of offers and requests for assistance and (iv) studying how to take advantage of the synergies that existed between the Committee's activities and those of organizations that worked in the area of governance but dealt with similar issues. The working group's progress was sometimes delayed by matters outside its control, such as the need to wait for responses from Member States.

14. At its next meeting, the working group would consider how the Committee's assistance efforts fitted within the general framework of the counter-terrorism assistance activities of other bilateral and multilateral organizations in the area of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons; the group of experts would present the database it had prepared to facilitate follow-up of offers and requests for assistance; there would be an update on the financial aspects of assistance; and consideration would be given to other general issues, including assistance-related events, country-specific visits and governance.

15. **The Chair** underlined the importance of the working group, bearing in mind the need for prompt follow-up of requests for assistance and the Committee's role as a platform for cooperation between Member States.

16. **Mr. Wieland** (Austria), speaking in his capacity as coordinator of the working group on cooperation with international organizations, including the Security Council Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1373 (2001), said that the working group had focused to a major extent on preparing a draft common strategy for engaging with international, regional and subregional organizations. Following discussion and a number of amendments, it had taken note of a revised draft strategy, which would be submitted to the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) and the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) (the "1267 Committee"), with a view to all three Security Council Committees that dealt with terrorism taking note of the common strategy.

17. The working group had also assisted in preparations for the comprehensive review by drawing up a list of international and regional organizations, which had subsequently been invited to participate in the open meetings held. The Chief of the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) had briefed the working group and its experts on cooperation between the two bodies and had engaged in an exchange of views with them on how to expand such cooperation.

18. At its most recent meeting, the working group had discussed how to improve the common strategy on non-reporting and late-reporting States. It had requested the group of experts, in conjunction with CTED and the Monitoring Team of the 1267 Committee, to explore whether that strategy should be expanded and modified to focus more specifically on non-responding States. The working group had also discussed the possibility of establishing common strategies in such areas as the provision of assistance and the organization of regional workshops. At the same meeting, the group of experts had provided the working group with an update on recent bilateral contacts with international organizations and had been requested to draw up a table showing levels of cooperation with all international and regional organizations. Such a tool would enable the working group and the Committee to devise a tailored approach to each organization and so to deepen the Committee's cooperation with specific international organizations. Representatives of various organizations would also be

invited to give briefings to the working group, preferably at an expert level.

19. **Mr. Gordon** (United States of America), speaking in his capacity as the coordinator of the working group on transparency and media outreach, said that the working group would be pleased to serve as a conduit for the pro bono legal assistance offered by the George Washington University to the Committee's group of experts. Secondly, the Maritime Security Council, an industry group on maritime security, had requested a meeting sponsored by the Committee, at which it would brief the Committee on its work. Although no date had as yet been agreed, the working group wished to facilitate that meeting and other related events.

20. The Committee's success was to a major extent dependent on its ability to advertise its work to the broader international community. In that regard, the Committee's website was one of its main tools for outreach, especially to delegations not based in New York. As requested, frequently asked questions would shortly be included on the website. He would like to know whether the Committee would also be open to posting some visit reports on the website, since they were a good source of information on its past outreach and implementation work. His delegation stood ready to assist in finding an agreed common format for posting such reports, in consultation with the group of experts.

21. **The Chair** said that discussions would be held with a view to designating a new coordinator for the working group on monitoring and national implementation.

Report on the work of the group of experts

22. **Mr. Kasprzyk** (Expert), reporting to the Committee on the work of the group of experts, said that he would firstly provide an overview of recent and future activities. Following the completion of the comprehensive review and the adoption of the ninth programme of work, the experts had continued to work on the tasks derived from the programme of work or other instructions from the Committee. They were identifying sets of tasks and sub-tasks that could be assigned internally within the group of experts in order to be able to keep track of achievements and support the Committee in all aspects of its mandate in a timely and efficient manner.

23. In the area of monitoring and implementation, the experts had engaged in dialogue with several States on a range of issues, including new legislation, areas for further implementation, and assistance requirements. They had also been gathering relevant information in order to update the matrices.

24. With regard to assistance, they had been working on the tasks assigned to them by the relevant working group and would be presenting their activities at its forthcoming meeting. In consultation with the Department of Political Affairs, they had also been considering procedures for handling assistance requests in a timely and efficient manner. They had prepared a non-paper on the proposed conference on assistance, which had been submitted to the coordinator of the working group, and had drafted a non-paper on a proposed methodology for conducting country-specific visits. They had received several informal requests for such visits in the course of their dialogue with States.

25. The working group on cooperation with international organizations had encouraged the group of experts to revive regular joint meetings with their counterparts in the Security Council Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1373 (2001) and to foster dialogue with relevant international organizations. In that regard, a number of lunch-time meetings would be held, including with the head of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF). The group of experts was also working on a table to show the status of cooperation with other international organizations, as requested by the working group.

26. With regard to transparency and media outreach, the Committee's matrix template and matrices of Member States approved by the Committee had now been posted on the website. The group of experts was also working on the posting of a calendar of outreach events and workshops, and had prepared two abridged summaries of trip reports, with a view to posting them on the website once agreement had been reached on the format. The provisional list of frequently asked questions was also awaiting finalization for publication online.

27. When considering attending an event, the experts first evaluated the event's relevance to the resolution and then submitted a proposal to the Chair. The time taken to submit trip reports to the Committee had been reduced.

28. Since 1 January 2010, experts had attended nine outreach events. On 2-3 February, Mr. Cupitt had attended the Fourth Annual Workshop on Reducing the Risk from Radioactive and Nuclear Materials, held in Arlington, Virginia by the Institute of Nuclear Materials Management, where he had made informal remarks. On 26 January, he himself had made a presentation at a workshop on strategic trade controls held for Algerian Government officials by the Center for International Trade and Security of the University of Georgia. From 2-4 February, he and Mr. Muhi, along with Mr. Arrocha from the Permanent Mission of Mexico, had attended the Africa Regional Workshop on Biosafety and Biosecurity. On 28-29 January, Mr. Andemicael had attended a workshop on the Legal Framework for Strengthening Nuclear Security and Combating Terrorism held jointly by the Center for International Trade and Security of the University of Georgia and the International Relations University of Moscow. From 9-11 February 2010, Ms. Bosch and Ms. Cerini had accompanied the Chair to the preparatory meeting for the Nuclear Security Summit held in The Hague, where informal consultations had taken place with approximately 10 countries and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. Ms. Interlandi had attended the 29th session of the Enforcement Committee of the World Customs Organization. From 4-6 March 2010, Mr. Andemicael had accompanied the Chair to the Conference on Nuclear Energy Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, held in Moscow by the Center for Energy and Security Studies. From 10-12 March, Ms. Bosch had attended the crisis management exercise on bio-attack held in Trinidad and Tobago, where she had made a presentation and conducted dialogues with each of the 12 Caribbean countries attending. On 16 March, he had attended the 10th Export Control Academy held by the Center for International Trade and Security of the University of Georgia.

29. Upcoming events included a workshop on implementation of the resolution, to be hosted by Azerbaijan at the end of April, and a side event to be conducted at the Nuclear Security Summit by non-governmental organizations, to which the Chair was expected to be invited.

30. Of the 117 matrices approved by the Committee in April 2008, 107 had been posted on the Committee website. Ten had not, at the request of the relevant States. The experts were working on 75 remaining matrices, which they hoped to submit for approval to the Chair by 7 May 2010. The 117 approved matrices would be updated by the middle of August 2010.

31. **Mr. Gordon** (United States of America) noted the progress made on the posting of matrices, but wished to know what progress had been made on posting narrative country reports.

32. **Mr. Kostov** (Secretary of the Committee) said that country reports submitted in narrative form, and in particular initial reports, continued to be issued as documents of the Security Council. It had not yet been decided how to handle reports that combined narrative text and matrices, and he welcomed any suggestions from the Committee members.

33. **Mr. Wieland** (Austria) said that once the experts' future travel plans had been decided, they should be shared with the other expert bodies. The joint meetings with experts from the other Security Council committees that dealt with terrorism would be an ideal forum for such information exchange.

34. **Mr. Kostov** (Secretary of the Committee) said that there were two more workshops on border control planned for 2010. There had also been an offer from the Government of Vietnam to host a workshop for members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and an offer from the Government of Croatia to conduct an additional workshop on border control in June. Financial support from the European Union and several of its member States had made those additional workshops possible. The Office of Disarmament Affairs had already begun to solicit funding for the activities outlined in Committee's ninth programme of work.

35. **Mr. Chatel** (France) said that selection of outreach activities to attend should be based on consideration of both the added value the experts brought to those activities and the benefits those activities offered to the Committee in terms of increasing the number of reporting countries and facilitating the process of matching donors to countries requesting assistance. Although there should not be a rigid set of rules, such considerations would maximize the use of the experts' time.

36. **The Chair** said that such considerations were indeed always discussed when outreach activities were being considered.

Other matters

37. **Mr. Kostov** (Secretary of the Committee) said that he had prepared an outline formalizing the procedure for processing requests for assistance. All requests received by the Secretariat would go to the Chair. Requesters would be encouraged to submit requests through formal channels using the template provided on the Committee website. In cases where it was not clear whether a request had been officially authorized by a State, it would have to be resubmitted through that State's permanent mission. Requests forwarded to the Committee by international organizations would be considered on a case-by-case basis. All requests would be circulated to Committee members, the Office of Disarmament Affairs and the experts, and summaries of requests would be posted on the website within two days of circulation. The Chair would send a letter of acknowledgement to the requesting State, and forward the request to potential providers in a letter modelled on the "CARICOM Note Verbale" (S/AC.44/2009/NOTE.35/Add.1) to be sent to the list of providers used for that Note. At any point, any Committee members could ask that a specific request be discussed at a meeting of the working group on assistance.

38. Matchmaking between specific requesters and assistance providers would be handled informally by the experts. Specific offers of assistance, notes of acknowledgement by the Chairman and letters informing requesters of offers would be circulated to Committee members. One year after the request, the Chair would send a formal follow-up letter, although the experts would encourage both requesters and providers to keep the Committee informed on the outcome of matchmaking efforts and would brief the Committee every three months.

39. He stressed that the outline contained nothing new and merely systematized the procedure that was, in effect, already being followed. If the Committee agreed to the proposed procedures, the silence procedure would be dispensed with for several steps in the process, including the Chair's letters of acknowledgement to requesting States, the Chair's letter forwarding requests to the list of providers, and the Chair's letters to requesters informing them of specific offers of assistance.

40. **Mr. Chatel** (France) said that a brief discussion of the procedure would be useful, and a flow chart describing each step of the process would make it easier to follow. Dispensing with the silence procedure at several stages of the process would eliminate delays that had proven frustrating for requesters in the past. He expressed concern that too many formal procedures might be burdensome for certain countries and stressed that the process should not be too inflexible.

41. **Mr. Wieland** (Austria) said that he agreed that doing away with some of the silence procedures would streamline the process and make more efficient use of the Committee's resources.

42. **Mr. Litavrin** (Expert) noted that some States were reluctant to have information about their assistance requests made public, and formal procedures requiring them to reveal more information would be counterproductive.

43. **The Chair** said that the proposal should be distributed to the Committee members and taken up by the working group on assistance.

44. *It was so decided.*

45. **Mr. Gordon** (United States of America) said that it had come to his attention that experts were not always paid in a timely fashion. That matter should be raised with the Secretariat.

46. **Mr. Sitnikov** (Russian Federation) said that the consultations that had been held in Moscow had been constructive and useful. While formalization of procedures could facilitate work, there were times when sensitive issues should be dealt with in an informal fashion, and it was important to obtain consent from the States concerned before making any information public. He agreed that timely payment of experts was important.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.